



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_46710
Title of the Manuscript:	The Impact of transportation Infrastructure on Economic growth: Empirical evidence from Saudi Arabia 1988-2017.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The paper employs the VAR-based pairwise Granger causality test to investigate the causal relationship between road transport infrastructure and economic growth in Saudi Arabia. The paper is fairly well written, though there are lots of grammatical and syntax errors. The paper therefore requires some editing to enhance its readability. The introduction of the paper is quite comprehensive and the paper is well motivated. The objective of the study is clearly stated. However, there are some issues with the structure of the paper. I have made some suggestions in the manuscript to enhance its structure. The author(s) may wish to adopt the suggested corrections. The literature review is generally well written. The methodology is good and matches the objective of the study. However, there are serious issues with the discussion of the empirical results. The author should revisit these. The issues are shown as review comments in the attached manuscript. The conclusion of the study does not flow from the empirical evidence. This is a very serious flaw of the study and should be corrected before the paper can be considered for publication. The recommendation of the study is also not based on the empirical evidence. The author(s) is/are advised to download the reviewed manuscript attached herewith for further comments. Aspect of the abstract, particularly the recommendation need to be rewritten to reflect the empirical evidence of the study.	Done
Minor REVISION comments	Editorial corrections needed	Done
Optional/General comments	The paper can be published subject to major revision	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	No